UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,958	10/24/2001	Jion-Iou Hong	3158/0J954	4878

7590 09/08/2004

DARBY & DARBY P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER	
ANYASO, UCHENDU O	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2675	8

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/045,958	HONG, JION-IOU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Uchendu O Anyaso	2675	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. **Claims 1-10** are pending in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-3,** and **6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Harshbarger et al* (U.S. Patent 4,670,782).

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Harshbarger teaches an invention that provides a video pattern generator comprising a keyboard means for individually entering data values representing the incremental pulse width and timing parameters for all the scan rate pulses comprising a raster scan structure wherein a sync generator means is provided coupled to the keyboard means for generating a time based scan rate composed of pulse elements having the selected pulse widths and timing values (column 5, lines 34-42).

Furthermore, Harshbarger teaches a plurality of signal generators by teaching a horizontal generator 38 and a vertical generator 40 (figure 1A at 38, 40).

Furthermore, Harshbarger teaches a synchronization activator generating a first signal by teaching sync generator 42 that is connected to a sync gen bus 34 (figure 1A at 34, 42).

Also, Harshbarger teaches a pattern selector generating a second signal identifying one of the patterns by teaching pattern select switch 24 and pattern generator 43 (figure 1 at 24, 43).

Furthermore, Harshbarger teaches a controller by means of CPU 32 that is connected to signal generators 38, 40 and simultaneously activating these horizontal and vertical signal generators that drive the system to display the patterns identified by pattern select switch 24 (*see* column 8, lines 56 through column 9, lines 1-20, figures 1A, 1B).

Regarding **independent claim 6**, Harshbarger teaches an invention that provides a video pattern generator comprising a keyboard means for individually entering data values representing the incremental pulse width and timing parameters for all the scan rate pulses comprising a raster scan structure wherein a sync generator means is provided coupled to the keyboard means for generating a time based scan rate composed of pulse elements having the selected pulse widths and timing values (column 5, lines 34-42).

Furthermore, Harshbarger teaches a plurality of signal generators by teaching a horizontal generator 38 and a vertical generator 40 (figure 1A at 38, 40).

Furthermore, Harshbarger teaches a synchronization activator generating a first signal by teaching sync generator 42 that is connected to a sync gen bus 34 (figure 1A at 34, 42).

Also, Harshbarger teaches a pattern selector generating a second signal identifying one of the patterns by teaching pattern select switch 24 and pattern generator 43 (figure 1 at 24, 43). Also, Harshbarger teaches how the pattern select switch would be operable independently from the sync generator 42 (column 8, lines 23-35, figures 1A, 2A).

Furthermore, Harshbarger teaches a controller by means of CPU 32 that is connected to signal generators 38, 40 and simultaneously activating these horizontal and vertical signal

generators that drive the system to display the patterns identified by pattern select switch 24 (*see* column 8, lines 56 through column 9, lines 1-20, figures 1A, 1B).

Regarding **claims 2** and **3**, in further discussion of claim 1, Harshbarger teaches how keypad 16 and the pattern select switch interact as BCD devices wherein the scan rate parameters is entered into the keypad 16 and thereafter the operator can select the test patterns quickly by manipulation of the pattern select switch knob 24 (column 8, lines 27-35, figure 1A, 2A at 16, 24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 4** and **5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harshbarger et al* (U.S. Patent 4,670,782) in view of *Estes* (U.S. Patent 4,093,960).

Regarding **claims 4** and **5**, in further discussion of claim 1, Harshbarger does not teach explicitly power in the display system. However, Estes teaches a test signal generating system comprising a power switch 31 that is utilized to control the application of power to the system (figure 1, 15-20 at 31, column 17, lines 24-28).

Thus, it is would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art as to combine Harshbarger and Estes because while Harshbarger teaches a synchronization activator

generating a first signal by teaching sync generator 42 (figure 1 at 42) and a pattern selector generating a second signal identifying one of the patterns by teaching pattern select switch and pattern generator 43 (figure 1 at 24, 43), Estes teaches a test signal generating system comprising a power switch 31 that is utilized to control the application of power to the system (figure 1, 15-20 at 31, column 17, lines 24-28). The motivation for doing so would have been to supply the needed potential to the system that would enable the operation of the system.

6. **Claims 7-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harshbarger et al* (U.S. Patent 4,670,782) in view of *Kaminkow* (U.S. Patent 6,780,105).

Regarding **claims 7-10**, in further discussion of claim 1, Harshbarger does not teach multiple display panels wherein all the display panels display the same pattern. However, Kaminkow teaches this feature a video display that contains multiple screens wherein all the screens display the same pattern (*see* Abstract; column 9, lines 42-52, figure 16).

Thus, it is would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art as to combine Harshbarger and Kaminkow because while Harshbarger teaches a controller by means of CPU 32 that is connected to signal generators 38, 40 and simultaneously activating these horizontal and vertical signal generators that drive the system to display the patterns identified by pattern select switch 24 (*see* column 8, lines 56 through column 9, lines 1-20, figures 1A, 1B), Kaminkow teaches a video display that contains multiple screens wherein all the screens display would same test pattern (*see* Abstract; column 9, lines 42-52, figure 16). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to emphasize a particular test pattern (column 3, lines 4-6).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, Applicant argues that Harshbarger does not teach a plurality of signal generator cards. However, Harshbarger teaches a plurality of signal generators by teaching a horizontal generator 38 and a vertical generator 40 (figure 1A at 38, 40).

Also, Applicant contends that each of the SG cards is connected to the controller by multiple signal lines and one control line for panel testing. On this issue, Applicant should note that Harshbarger teaches a controller by means of CPU 32 that is connected to signal generators 38, 40 and simultaneously activating these horizontal and vertical signal generators that drive the system to display the patterns identified by pattern select switch 24 (*see* column 8, lines 56 through column 9, lines 1-20, figures 1A, 1B).

With respect to claim 6, Applicant argues that the pattern selector and the sync generator operate independently from each other, and thus, are allegedly structurally and functionally different from the claimed subject matter of claim 6. Applicant should note that Harshbarger teaches a pattern selector generating a second signal identifying one of the patterns by teaching pattern select switch 24 and pattern generator 43 (figure 1 at 24, 43). Also, Harshbarger teaches how the pattern select switch would be operable independently from the sync generator 42 (column 8, lines 23-35, figures 1A, 2A).

With respect to claim 3, Applicant contends that Harshbarger fails to teach how the pattern select switch and the pattern generator are BCD device. However, Harshbarger teaches this concept by teaching how keypad 16 and the pattern select switch interact as BCD devices

wherein the scan rate parameters is entered into the keypad 16 and thereafter the operator can select the test patterns quickly by manipulation of the pattern select switch knob 24 (column 8, lines 27-35, figure 1A, 2A at 16, 24).

With respect to claim 4, Applicant argues the motivation for combining Harshbarger and Estes. Harshbarger fails to **explicitly** state a power switch. Although it would be inferred that Harshbarger would have a power switch in order to be enabling, this feature is not stated literally. Estes solves this deficiency by teaching how a test signal generating system would comprise a power switch 31 that is utilized to control the application of power to the system (figure 1, 15-20 at 31, column 17, lines 24-28). The clear and simple motivation for doing so would have been to supply the needed potential to the system that would enable the operation of the system.

As such, applicant's amendments and arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action..

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uchendu O. Anyaso whose telephone number is (703) 306-5934. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Uchendu O. Anyaso

09/4/2004

DENNIS-DOON CHOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER